

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 1st ONE HUNDRED INVESTMENT
8 POOL, LLC,

9 Plaintiff(s),

10 v.

11 CARMEN J. ROSE, et al.,

12 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-CV-1233 JCM (PAL)

ORDER

13
14 Presently before this court is plaintiff 1st One Hundred Investment Pool, LLC's emergency
15 motion to extend time to respond to defendants Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company
16 ("BNY") and Sables, LLC's ("Sables") motions to dismiss. (ECF No. 14). BNY filed its motion
17 to dismiss on May 26, 2017, (ECF No. 7) and Sables filed its motion to dismiss on May 30, 2017,
18 (ECF No. 8).

19 Specifically, plaintiff argues that it does not want to incur legal fees to produce responses
20 to the motions to dismiss before its May 26, 2017, motion to remand is adjudicated. *See* (ECF No.
21 14). Therefore, plaintiff requests "an order of continuance to file its responses to defendants'
22 motions to dismiss, or, alternatively, a request for stay of briefing, until its motion for remand is
23 resolved." (*Id.* at 1).

24 Plaintiff's requests will be denied for multiple procedural reasons. First, emergency
25 consideration under Local Rule 7-4 is explicitly inapplicable to "requests for procedural relief,
26 e.g., a motion to extend time to file a brief." LR 7-4. Second, the motion to remand is not yet ripe.
27 *See* (ECF No. 6); *see also* LR 7-2(b). Finally, "[f]or each type of relief requested . . . a separate
28

1 document must be filed and a separate event must be selected for that document” on the electronic
2 docketing system. LR IC 2-2(b).

3 Accordingly,

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff’s emergency
5 motion (ECF No. 14) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

6 DATED June 7, 2017.

7 
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE